

REMARKS

Claims 1-11 appear in this application for the Examiner's review and consideration. Applicants thank the Examiner for the indication of allowable subject matter with respect to claims 9 and 11. Claim 10 has been amended to correct a typographical error. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application.

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 3-8 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,077,66 to Brimm. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Independent claim 1 recites, inter alia, "selecting a document to be completed by more than one party", "providing at least one request to a first user at a first location on a computer network for information used to complete the document", "providing at least one request to a second user at a second location on the computer network for information used to complete the document" and "writing information obtained from the first and second users used to complete the document onto at least one digital file."

With respect to claim 1, the Examiner indicates on pages 2-3 of the Office Action that Brimm teaches "selecting a document to be completed by more than one party; See 4:1-50;" "providing at least one request to a first user at a first location on a computer network for information used to complete the document; See 4:1-50; 6:35-51;" "receiving at least one response to the at least one request from the first user used to complete the document; See 3:55-67; 9:31-54;" "providing at least one request to a second user at a second location on the computer network for information used to complete the document; See 3:55-67; 9:31-54;"

“receiving at least one response to the [at] least one request from the second user used to complete the document; See 3:55-67; 5:20-55; 9:31-54; and” “writing information obtained from the first and second users used to complete the document onto at least one digital file; See 5:20-55; 9:31-53; 10:50-61.”

Applicants respectfully submit that Brimm does not anticipate the foregoing rejected claim for at least the reasons set forth below.

With respect to claim 1, applicants respectfully submit that Brimm does not teach a method where users “select[] a document to be completed by more than one party” and in which method “provid[es] at least one request to a first user at a first location on a computer network for information used to complete the document” and “provid[es] at least one request to a second user at a second location on the computer network for information used to complete the document” as recited. According to the presently claimed invention, a single multi-part document is interactively processed over a computer network by different parties. Advantageously, different portions of the same document designated for completion by different parties may be completed interactively by different parties at different locations and requests concerning the document may be automatically sent to the appropriate second party upon completion of the portions of the document required by the first party. For example, one part of a certificate of medical necessity may be completed by a supplier party at one location remotely. Upon completion of the appropriate information, the certificate requests concerning the certificate may be automatically sent to the physician party for the appropriate completion of a second part of the certificate which may, for example, require appropriate verification.

It is respectfully submitted that Brimm does not teach the claimed method of electronically processing a multi-part form document interactively by different parties and in particular, where one or more requests are provided to a second user for information used to complete the multi-part form document after the first user has provided information used to complete a different portion of the multi-part form document. Rather, Brimm is directed to methods by which a system user can chart the completion of tasks. (Col. 3, lines 55-58). In the first method the system user may chart the completion of a task without leaving the context of the task list by opening a window into the appropriate underlying form and charting the task directly onto such form. (Col. 3, lines 58-62). When the system user signs the completion of a task, the task list and other associated forms are automatically updated and the completion is recorded on the underlying form. (Col. 3, lines 63-66). In the second method, the system user may chart the completion of a task directly onto an appropriate system form, and when the system user signs the completion of the task on such form, the task list and any associated forms are automatically updated. (Col. 3, line 67- col. 4, line 6).

Brimm does not, in either the first or second method described, teach that upon the completion of tasks onto the task list form by the system user, that requests for information are provided to a second user for additional information needed to complete the multi-part form document from the second user. Rather, the system described by Brimm is implemented using a first form document where an order concerning a medically-related task is entered by a person responsible for providing medical care to the patient and where, as a result of such order, information is automatically added to a second form that includes a list of related tasks to be

performed regarding the patient that contains areas for recording by the person responsible for providing medical care the times when the tasks are actually performed. (Col . 4, lines 18-49). Accordingly, Brimm is not directed to a single multi-part form document to be completed by more than one party where one portion of the form document is completed by a first user and where upon completion of that portion of the form document by the first user, one or more requests for information are provided to a second user for completion of that form document. Accordingly, applicants respectfully submit that the claimed invention of independent claim 1 is not anticipated by Brimm and further respectfully request that the claim rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102 be withdrawn for the foregoing reasons.

Claims 2-7 each ultimately depend from claim 1. Applicants respectfully submit that because claims 2-7 ultimately depend from claim 1, claims 2-7 are not rendered obvious by for at least the reasons claims 1 is not rendered obvious by these references as discussed above. Accordingly, applicants respectfully requests that these claim be withdrawn.

Independent claim 8 recites, inter alia, “selecting a document to be completed by more than one party”, “providing at least one request to a first user at a first location on a computer network for information used to complete the document”, “providing at least one request to a second user at a second location on the computer network for information used to complete the document”, “writing information obtained from the first and second users used to complete the document onto at least one digital file”, and “wherein upon the recognition of an occurrence of an event on the computer network, a digital signature routine is performed on the at least one digital file to obtain a digital signature of the at least one digital file and wherein a time stamp

corresponding to the time of the recognition of the occurrence of the event is created, the digital signature and the time stamp being sent to a remote location.”

With respect to claim 8, the Examiner indicates on pages 4-5 of the Office Action that Brimm teaches “selecting a document to be completed by more than one party; See 5:20-55; 9:31-53; 10:50-61; 12:24-50” “providing at least one request to a first user at a first location on a computer network for information used to complete the document; See 5:20-55; 9:31-53; 10:50-61; 12:24-50;” “receiving at least one response to the at least one request from the first user used to complete the document; See 5:20-55; 9:31-53; 10:50-61; 12:24-50;” “providing at least one request to a second user at a second location on the computer network for information used to complete the document; See 5:20-55; 9:31-53; 10:50-61; 12:24-50;” “receiving at least one response to the [at] least one request from the second user used to complete the document; See 3:55-67; 5:20-55; 9:31-54; and” “writing information obtained from the first and second users used to complete the document onto at least one digital file; See 5:20-55; 9:31-53; 10:50-61; 12:24-50;” “wherein upon the recognition of an occurrence of an event on the computer network, a digital signature routine is performed on the at least one digital file to obtain a digital signature of the at least one digital file and wherein a time stamp corresponding to the time of the recognition of the occurrence of the event is created, the digital signature and the time stamp being sent to a remote location; See 5:20-55; 9:31-53; 10:50-61; 12:24-50”

With respect to claim 8, applicants respectfully submit that Brimm does not teach a method where users may “select[] a document to be completed by more than one party” and in which method “provid[es] at least one request to a first user at a first location on a computer

network for information used to complete the document” and “provid[es] at least one request to a second user at a second location on the computer network for information used to complete the document” as recited for at least the same reasons discussed above that Brimm does not teach the combination of these limitations as recited in claim 1.

Moreover, it is respectfully submitted that Brimm does not teach “upon the recognition of an occurrence of an event on the computer network, a digital signature routine is performed on the at least one digital file to obtain a digital signature of the at least one digital file and wherein a time stamp corresponding to the time of the recognition of the occurrence of the event is created, the digital signature and the time stamp being sent to a remote location” as recited in claim 8. Applicants respectfully submit that the text cited by the Examiner as disclosing this limitation nowhere teaches the step of performing a digital signature on the at least one digital file upon the recognition of an occurrence of an event on the computer system (for example, when the form document is completed by the first user) and creating a time stamp corresponding to the event. Although the text cited by the Examiner does, in some instances, use the words “time” and “sign”, the text does not teach performing a digital signature on the digital file itself to obtain a unique representation of the file upon the occurrence of an event or creating a time stamp at the time of event. Brimm also does not teach sending this information to a remote location as recited in claim 8. Performing a digital signature and timestamp and sending this information to a remote location allows for the contents of the digital file to be verified to show when its contents came into existence and whether the file has been altered at a later date. Accordingly, applicants respectfully submit that the claimed invention of independent claim 8 is

not anticipated by Brimm and further respectfully request that the claim rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102 be withdrawn for the foregoing reasons.

Independent claim 10 recites, inter alia, to “send at least one request associated with the selected document to a second user at a second location on a computer network”, “receive at least one response to the at least one request from the second user; and write information obtained from the at least one response from the first and second users onto the at least one digital file.”

With respect to claim 10 as presently amended, the Examiner indicates on pages 5-6 of the Office Action that Brimm, inter alia, discloses to “send at least one request associated with the selected document to a second user at a second location on a computer network; See 5:20-55; 9:31-53; 10:50-61; 12:24-50” “receive at least one response to the at least one request from the second user; See 5:20-55; 9:31-53; 10:50-61; 12:24-50;” “and write information obtained from the at least one response from the first and second users onto at least one digital file; See 5:20-55; 9:31-53; 10:50-61; 12:24-50.

With respect to claim 10, applicants respectfully submit that Brimm does not teach a system having a processor operative with a program to “send at least one request associated with the selected document to a second user at a second location on a computer network”, “receive at least one response to the at least one request from the second user; and write information obtained from the at least one response from the first and second users onto the at least one digital file” as recited. Specifically, it is respectfully submitted that Brimm does not teach the claimed system for interactive processing of a multi-part form document by different users and in particular, where one or more requests are sent to a second user for information used to complete the multi-

Application No. 09/943,670
Amendment dated September 1, 2004
Reply to Office Action March 1, 2004

part form document after the first user has provided information used to complete a different portion of the multi-part form document for the reasons discuss above with respect to claim 1. Accordingly, applicants respectfully submit that the claimed invention of independent claim 10 is not anticipated by Brimm and further respectfully request that the claim rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102 be withdrawn for the foregoing reasons.

In view of the foregoing, applicants therefore respectfully submit that the rejection of claims under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103 has been overcome. Claims 1-11 are believed to be in condition for allowance, which allowance is respectfully requested. The Commissioner is authorized to charge any fees that may be required in connection with this response to Deposit Account No. 50-0521 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: September 1, 2004



Mark Rueh
Reg. No. 43,896

Customer No. 27383
Clifford Chance US LLP
31 West 52nd Street
New York, NY 10019-6131
Telephone: (212) 878-8098